AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 1, 1997 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 15, 1997 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 31, 1997

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—1997-98 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 339

Introduced by Assembly Members Takasugi and Wildman (Coauthor: Assembly Member Sweeney)

February 18, 1997

An act to amend Section 30055 of the Government Code, relating to taxation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 339, as amended, Takasugi. Sales and use taxes: revenue allocation: local public safety services.

Existing law requires that revenues derived from a specified state sales and use tax rate imposed by the California Constitution be apportioned to certain counties, to allocated to cities within those counties for the funding of local public safety services, as defined. Existing law generally requires, for the 1996-97 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, that each recipient county allocate these sales and use tax revenues to those cities within its boundaries that provide public safety services in accordance with an allocation factor determined as a ratio for each of those cities in accordance with a specified formula. The formula contains a specified percentage cap that limits the size of this ratio.

AB 339 -2-

This bill would modify the formula for computing each eity's allocation factor by removing this percentage cap, and would instead establish a similar percentage cap that directly limits the amount of revenue to be allocated to each city. By imposing new duties with respect to the allocation of sales and use tax revenues within certain counties for the 1996–97 fiscal year, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

would eliminate this general allocation requirement, and would require, commencing September 1997, that each recipient city be allocated a reconciliation amount, as defined, in 36 monthly installments. This bill would also generally require, for the 1997-98 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, that each recipient city be allocated an amount determined in accordance with the portion of revenues that was allocated to that city for the 1995–96 fiscal year. By imposing new duties with respect to the allocation of sales and use tax revenues within certain counties, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would also establish a specific allocation including provisions for the formula, allocation reconciliation amounts, as defined, for cities within Los Angeles County.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement, including the creation of a State Mandates Claims Fund to pay the costs of mandates that do not exceed \$1,000,000 statewide and other procedures for claims whose statewide costs exceed \$1,000,000.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

This bill would provide that it would be operative only if AB 334 of the 1997–98 Regular Session is enacted and becomes effective on or before January 1, 1998.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Vote: $\frac{2}{3}$. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: yes.

3 AB 339

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 30055 of the Government Code is amended to read:

30055. For the 1996–97 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, each county shall establish a Public Safety Augmentation Fund in the county treasury to receive those revenues allocated to the county pursuant to Sections 30052 and 30053. Amounts deposited in this fund shall be expended exclusively to fund public safety services, and for that purpose shall be allocated among the county and the cities in the county that provide public safety services, as follows:

- (a) (1) For purposes of determining the amounts to be allocated to cities, the auditor shall, except as otherwise provided in subdivision (b), (c), or (d), and subject to the allocation limit set forth in paragraph (2), multiply the monthly amount allocated to the county pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 30053 by an allocation factor for each city, calculated as follows:
- (A) The numerator shall be the difference between the amount of ad valorem property tax revenue shifted from that city to the county's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, and the amount of vehicle license fee revenues allocated to the city pursuant to Section 11005.4 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
- (B) The denominator shall be the amount of ad valorem property tax revenue shifted from the county and all cities in the county to the county's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, less the amount of vehicle license fee revenues allocated to the county and all cities in the county pursuant to Section 11005.4 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
- 36 (2) Notwithstanding the calculations required by 37 paragraph (1), in no event shall the allocation 38 determined for a city pursuant to this subdivision exceed

AB 339 —4—

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

17

19

23

24

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38 39

50 percent of the difference between the following 2 amounts:

- (A) The amount by which the city's allocation of property tax revenues was reduced pursuant to Section 97.3 for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
- (B) The amount of vehicle license fees allocated to the eity pursuant to Section 11005.4 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
- (b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section in each county described in paragraph (3) shall be allocated to the cities in that county that provide public safety services, as follows:
- (1) The auditor shall determine an allocation factor for each city within the county, the numerator of which shall 16 be the amount of the revenue shifted from that city to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to 18 Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, and the denominator of which shall be the amount of revenue shifted from all cities in the county to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
 - (2) The auditor shall multiply 5 percent of the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section by the allocation factor determined for each city in paragraph (1). The amount so computed for each city shall be allocated to that city.
 - (3) This subdivision applies only to the Counties of Fresno, Kings, Merced, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo.
 - (4) This subdivision shall apply to a particular county described in paragraph (3) only if the total amount allocated under this paragraph to all of the cities therein that provide public safety services is less than the amount that would otherwise be allocated to all of those cities pursuant to subdivision (a).
 - (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section for the County of Alameda shall be allocated to the

5 AB 339

cities in the County of Alameda that provide public safety services as follows:

- (1) The auditor shall determine an allocation factor for each city within the county, the numerator of which shall be the amount of the revenue shifted from that city to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, and the denominator of which shall be the amount of revenue shifted from all cities in the County of Alameda to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.
- (2) The auditor shall multiply 6.1 percent of the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section by the allocation factor determined for each eity in paragraph (1). The amount so computed for each eity shall be allocated to that eity.
- (d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), for the 1997–98 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the auditor in the County of San Diego shall allocate to each eligible city in the county that provides public safety services, from the county's Public Safety Augmentation Fund created pursuant to paragraph (1), an amount obtained by multiplying the amount in the Public Safety Augmentation Fund by the allocation factor listed below for each city:

26 f 27

28	Carlsbad	0.3582694
29	Chula Vista	0.3126700
30	Coronado	0.1205707
31	Del Mar	0.0266781
32	El Cajon	0.1479797
33	Escondido	0.2874369
34	Imperial Beach	0.0543447
35	La Mesa	0.1035164
36	Lemon Grove	0.0151415
37	National City	0.0569347
38	Oceanside	0.6955004
39	San Diego	3.1831131

AB 339 -6-

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

15

16

17

18

19

21 22

26

27

33

34

35

0.0585130 0.2269571

(e) All moneys in the Public Safety Augmentation Fund not allocated to any city within the county pursuant to subdivision (a), (b), (c), or (d) shall be allocated to the county.

SECTION 1. Section 30055 of the Government Code is amended to read:

30055. For the 1996–97 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, each county shall establish a Public Safety Augmentation Fund in the county treasury to receive those revenues allocated to the county pursuant to Sections 30052 and 30053. Amounts deposited in this fund shall be expended exclusively to fund public safety services, and for that purpose shall be allocated among the county and the cities in the county that provide public safety services, as follows:

- (a) For purposes of determining the amounts to be 20 allocated In allocating revenues from the Public Safety Augmentation Fund to cities, the auditor shall, except as otherwise provided in subdivision (b), (c), or (d), multiply the monthly amount allocated to the county pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 30053 by an 25 allocation factor for each city, calculated as follows:
- (1) The numerator shall be 50 percent of the difference between the amount of ad valorem property tax revenue shifted from that city to the county's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to 30 Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993-94 fiscal year, and the amount of vehicle license fee revenues allocated to the city pursuant to Section 11005.4 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993-94 fiscal year.
- (2) The denominator shall be the amount of ad 36 valorem property tax revenue shifted from the county and all cities in the county to the county's Educational 38 Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993-94 fiscal year, less the amount of vehicle license fee revenues

—7 — **AB 339**

1 allocated to the county and all cities in the county pursuant to Section 11005.4 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993-94 (d), or (e), comply with all of the 4 following:

5

11

12

17

18

23

24

26 27

34 35

36

37

- (1) For the 1997–98 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the auditor shall allocate to each city from the county's Public Safety Augmentation Fund the same percentage of the total amount of moneys deposited in that fund that was allocated to that city for the 1995–96 10 fiscal year.
- (2) (A) In accordance with the payment schedule set forth in subparagraph (B), the auditor shall, commencing 13 with September 1997, allocate to each city that city's 14 reconciliation amount if, and only if, the reconciliation 15 amount is a positive number. For purposes of this 16 subparagraph, a city's reconciliation amount means the difference between the following amounts:
- (i) The amount that would have been allocated to that 19 city from the county's Public Safety Augmentation Fund 20 for the 1996-97 fiscal year, if moneys had been so allocated to that city using the same percentage of the total amount of money deposited in that fund that was allocated to that city for the 1995–96 fiscal year.
- (ii) The amount that was in fact allocated from the 25 county's Public Safety Augmentation Fund to that city for the 1996–97 fiscal year.
- (B) The auditor shall allocate each city's reconciliation 28 amount to that city in 36 equal and consecutive monthly installments, commencing on September 1, 1997. Each of 30 these installments shall be paid at the same time as the regular monthly allocation made to that city pursuant to 32 this section, and no interest shall be paid on any of these installments. However, if directed by the board of supervisors, the county auditor may expedite payment of the installments.
 - (b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the amount in augmentation fund established pursuant section in each county described in paragraph (3) shall be allocated to the cities in that county that provide public safety services, as follows:

AB 339 —8 —

1

12 13

15

16

17 18

19

21

24

25

(1) The auditor shall determine an allocation factor for each city within the county, the numerator of which shall be the amount of the revenue shifted from that city to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, and the denominator of which shall be the amount of revenue shifted from all cities in the county 8 Educational Revenue Augmentation 9 pursuant to Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year. 10

- (2) The auditor shall multiply 5 percent of the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section by the allocation factor determined for each city 14 in paragraph (1). The amount so computed for each city shall be allocated to that city.
 - (3) This subdivision applies only to the Counties of Fresno, Kings, Merced, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo.
 - (4) This subdivision shall apply to a particular county described in paragraph (3) only if the total amount allocated under this paragraph to all of the cities therein that provide public safety services is less than the amount that would otherwise be allocated to all of those cities pursuant to subdivision (a).
 - (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the amount the augmentation fund established pursuant to section for the County of Alameda shall be allocated to the cities in the County of Alameda that provide public safety services as follows:
- 30 (1) The auditor shall determine an allocation factor for each city within the county, the numerator of which shall be the amount of the revenue shifted from that city to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant Section 97.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year, and the denominator of which shall be 36 the amount of revenue shifted from all cities in the 37 County of Alameda to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund pursuant to Section 97.3 of 38 Revenue and Taxation Code for the 1993–94 fiscal year.

—9— AB 339

(2) The auditor shall multiply 6.1 percent of the amount in the augmentation fund established pursuant to this section by the allocation factor determined for each city in paragraph (1). The amount so computed for each city shall be allocated to that city.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), for the 1997–98 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the auditor in the County of San Diego shall allocate to each eligible city in the county that provides public safety services, from the county's Public Safety Augmentation Fund created pursuant to paragraph (1), an amount obtained multiplying amount in Public the the Safety Augmentation Fund by the allocation factor listed below for each city:

14 15

1

5

6

10

12

13

Carlsbad	0.3582694
Chula Vista	0.3126700
Coronado	0.1205707
Del Mar	0.0266781
El Cajon	0.1479797
Escondido	0.2874369
Imperial Beach	0.0543447
La Mesa	0.1035164
Lemon Grove	0.0151415
National City	0.0569347
Oceanside	0.6955004
San Diego	3.1831131
San Marcos	0.0585130
Vista	0.2269571
	Coronado Del Mar El Cajon Escondido Imperial Beach La Mesa Lemon Grove National City Oceanside San Diego San Marcos

30 31

34 35

36

37

- (e) All moneys Notwithstanding subdivision (a), 32 *amount* in the Public Safety Augmentation established pursuant to this section for the County of Los Angeles shall be allocated to each eligible city in the county that provides public safety services as follows:
 - (1) For the 1997–98 and each fiscal year thereafter, the auditor shall allocate to eligible cities within the county the same percentage share of the augmentation fund that each eligible city received from amounts deposited into the augmentation fund for the 1995–96 fiscal year.

AB 339 — 10 —

5

6

10

12 13

14

16

17

21

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

30

(2) For the 1996-97 fiscal year, the auditor shall allocate to eligible cities within the county the amount that would have been allocated to each of those cities had subdivision (a), as it read on January 1, 1997, been applied to amounts deposited into the augmentation fund for the 1995–96 fiscal year.

- (3) Any amount calculated for a city pursuant to paragraph (2) that differs from the amount allocated to a city in the 1995-96 fiscal year shall be known as the "reconciliation amount."
- (4) Any positive reconciliation amount calculated for a city pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be allocated to the appropriate city according to the following schedule:
- (A) For the 1996–97 fiscal year, 50 percent of the 15 reconciliation amount shall be paid within 31 days of the effective date of the act adding this subdivision.
- (B) For the 1997–98 fiscal year, 25 percent of the 18 reconciliation amount shall be paid, on a monthly basis, in 12 equal installments, with the first payment due July 20, 1997. However, any installment that is due prior to the effective date of the act adding this subdivision is due within 31 days of the effective date of the act adding this subdivision if that effective date is after July 20, 1997.
 - (C) For the 1998–99 fiscal year, 25 percent of the reconciliation amount shall be paid in full by September *30*, *1998*.
 - (5) The amount due a city in the fiscal year identified in paragraph (4) shall be offset by the positive growth calculated as follows:
- (A) For the 1996–97 fiscal year, positive growth is the difference between a city's share of funds allocated in the 1995-96 fiscal year and the amount calculated as if paragraph (1) had been in effect for the 1996-97 fiscal 34 year. If positive growth for the 1996–97 fiscal year cannot 35 be calculated at the time the allocation is made to a city 36 pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4), the positive growth for the 1996–97 fiscal year will be treated 38 as an additional offset against payments to that city required pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4).

—11 — AB 339

(B) For the 1997–98 fiscal year, positive growth is the difference between a city's share of funds that would have been allocated in the 1996–97 fiscal year, had the allocation requirement of paragraph (1) been in effect for the 1996–97 fiscal year, and the amount calculated pursuant to paragraph (1) for the 1997–98 fiscal year.

- 7 (C) For the 1998–99 fiscal year, positive growth is the 8 difference between a city's share of funds allocated in the 9 1997–98 fiscal year, excluding the reconciliation amount 10 for that year, and the amount calculated pursuant to 11 paragraph (1) for the 1998–99 fiscal year.
 - (6) Reconciliation amounts due in the 1998–99 fiscal year that are paid later than September 30, 1998, shall be subject to interest at the rate of 7 percent calculated from July 1, 1997.
 - (f) All moneys in the Public Safety Augmentation Fund not allocated to any city within the county pursuant to subdivision (a), (b), (c), or (d), or (e) shall be allocated to the county.
 - (g) The amendments made to subdivision (a) by the act adding this subdivision shall be applicable for the 1997–98 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter.
 - SEC. 2. Notwithstanding Section 17610 of the Government Code, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code. If the statewide cost of the claim for reimbursement does not exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000), reimbursement shall be made from the State Mandates Claims Fund.
- Notwithstanding Section 17580 of the Government Code, unless otherwise specified, the provisions of this act shall become operative on the same date that the act takes effect pursuant to the California Constitution.
- 37 SEC. 3. This act shall become operative only if 38 Assembly Bill 334 is enacted and becomes effective on or 39 before January 1, 1998.

AB 339 — 12 —

SEC. 4. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to timely correct an unintended reduction, documented by specific calculations, to that portion of public safety revenues that is allocated in each county in each fiscal year to cities that provide essential public safety services, and to ensure that cities that provide these services receive their full and fair share of public safety revenues, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.